97-84037-26

Massachusetts. Bureau of Statistics of Labor.

Trained and supplementary workers...

Boston

1906

97-84037-26
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 115

Massachusetts. Bureau of Statistics of Labor.
Trained and supplementary workers in domestic service, prepared by the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, in collaboration with the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, Boston, Massachusetts ... Boston, Wright, 1906.
35 p. tables.

Reprint of part II of the Annual report for 1906.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 3-4-97 INITIALS: PB

TRACKING # : 22466

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

308
Z
Lindsay Box 115

TRAINED

AND

SUPPLEMENTARY WORKERS

IN

DOMESTIC SERVICE.

PREPARED BY THE
MASSACHUSETTS BUREAU OF STATISTICS OF LABOR
IN COLLABORATION WITH

THE

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION,
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

REPRINT FROM PART II OF THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1906.

BOSTON:
WRIGHT & POTTER PRINTING CO., STATE PRINTERS,
18 POST OFFICE SQUARE.
1906.

TRAINED

AND

SUPPLEMENTARY WORKERS

IN

DOMESTIC SERVICE.

PREPARED BY THE
MASSACHUSETTS BUREAU OF STATISTICS OF LABOR
IN COLLABORATION WITH

THE

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNION,
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

REPRINT FROM PART II OF THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1906.

BOSTON:
WRIGHT & POTTER PRINTING CO., STATE PRINTERS,
18 POST OFFICE SQUARE.
1906.

CONTENTS.

TRAINED AND SUPPLEMENTAL EMPLOYEES FOR DOMESTIC SERVICE.

	Page
Trained workers,	1-12
Need for skilled hands as well as trained minds,	1
Purpose of the Domestic Reform League,	1, 2
Actual demand and supply of trained workers in past seven years,	2
First investigation along the line of domestic service,	2
Investigation in 1901-02,	3
Number of clubs and branches to which schedules were sent,	4
States represented in the returns,	4
Inquiries on first section of schedule,	5
Answers received to first two inquiries,	5-7
Inducements suggested to lead household employees to desire training,	7-11
Nationalities of employees registered in the Domestic Reform League,	11, 12
Supplemental workers,	12-35
Inquiries on second section of schedule,	12-14
Number of hours per week outside helpers would be employed,	15
Days of the week for employing outside helpers,	15, 16
Hours of the day most convenient for having outside helpers,	16, 17
Opinions of employers regarding outside helpers	17-19
Living expenses and wages paid,	19-23
Total cost of all employees,	23
Average per capita cost of each employee,	24
Average cost to employer of domestic employee,	25
Reasons stated by employers for not substituting outside help for employees living in the house,	25-30
Statistics of general houseworkers,	30-32
An actual experiment in supplying houseworkers by the day or hour,	32-34
Day workers supplied by Domestic Reform League,	34
Results of the investigation,	35

APPROVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

Trained and Supplemental Employees for Domestic Service.

Trained Workers.

The permanent installation of manual training in the public school, and the growth of the trade training school movement, prove that the need of to-day is not only for trained minds, but for skilled hands as well. In the shops and factories of Massachusetts the tendency of employers is to give the preference to girls and women who are graduates of training schools. The old-time nurse, who had a "knack" for caring for the sick, has been crowded to the wall by the hospital graduate. Domestic service is apparently the one exception to this almost universal demand for skilled workers. While there are 90,342 women employed in domestic service in this State,* there are but two schools in which they may learn the many and varied requirements of housework, and the total number of pupils accommodated in these schools is only about 45.

In January, 1897, the Employment Committee of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union resolved to make an attempt to get nearer the source of the difficulties recognized as existing in domestic service in this country. For this purpose they organized the Domestic Reform League.

The objects of the League are the scientific and careful consideration of present conditions in domestic service; the awakening of the interest of women in the largest aspect of the problem; the recognition by the employer that fair conditions should be given for faithful service; and by the employee, that interested and efficient service must be given in exchange for fair wages and just conditions; and further the recognition by both employer and employee that efficiency should be a standard of wages.

To the Domestic Reform League, which "holds the Union's sense of responsibility toward the domestic problem to terms

* Housekeepers and stewardesses, 11,356; laundresses, 8,883; servants and waitresses, 70,103. *United States Census — 1900.*

of concrete effort," employers complain of the scarcity of employees for domestic service and of the high wages demanded, in consequence of such scarcity, by the incompetent. The records of the League, demonstrating that the ratio of the demand to the supply is about two to one, and that the wage offered to inexperienced workers has increased 33⅓ per cent in five years, verify these complaints.

The following table shows the actual demand and supply in the office of the Domestic Reform League for the past seven years:

Years.	Demand (Employers)	Supply (Employees)	Percentages of Supply to Demand
1898,	5,187	2,549	49.14
1899,	7,183	3,001	41.78
1900,	8,975	3,274	36.48
1901,	6,846	2,958	43.21
1902,	6,654	3,015	45.31
1903,	7,608	3,455	45.15
1904,	9,282	4,768	51.37

The Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, in collaboration with the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, has already published the results of the latter's investigations into "Social Conditions in Domestic Rervice;" "The Effort to Attract the Workers in Shops and Factories to Domestic Service;" "Social Statistics of Working Women; Hours of Labor in Domestic service; and Household Expenses."

These investigations were purely analytical, and while they proved that a social stigma is attached to domestic service, and that the hours of work are longer and more indefinite than in other occupations, they were not intended to be constructive, and attempted no remedy.

The first investigation of the Union indicative of constructive work along the lines of domestic service was an investigation, also published in collaboration with the Bureau of Statistics of Labor, into the "Cost of Home Made and Prepared Food," with a view to the feasibility of making some practical experiment in the delivery of cooked food. This investigation was followed some three years later by the experiment of delivering dinners hot to patrons in their homes. The effort, initiated in 1903, is still being pursued and developed through the Food Supply Department of the Union.

In 1901–02, as a further step toward an investigation of the possibility of organizing housework under the industrial conditions that prevail in other trades, and an endeavor to throw light on the possibility of a higher degree of training and efficiency on the part of household employees, the inquiries here reported were instigated.

In order to obtain material which might be suggestive of improvement in the standards and status of the domestic worker, the Domestic Reform League determined to ask experienced housekeepers two questions: First, how the interest of the houseworker could be aroused to desire for herself the equivalent of trade training; and, second, whether present domestic difficulties could be alleviated by having a part of the housework done by persons living outside the house and coming in by the day or hour.

Five thousand question blanks embodying these questions were accordingly prepared and sent to the officers of each of the Federated Clubs of Massachusetts, and to all branches of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ throughout the United States, with a letter asking that the blanks be distributed to the best advantage among such members of the organizations in question as would be most apt to be interested.

The Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs had at that time a membership of 15,572, representative of conservative and experienced Eastern housekeepers.

These answers are valuable as representing what might be termed local color in the two phases of household economics presented. They are also the opinions of the average club woman, and are instructive as such, demonstrating, as they do, that, while the club woman may be interested in civic improvement and cultural and industrial progress, she looks upon domestic service as a calling in which there is no hope that it may be elevated ultimately to the dignity of other trades, with regularly defined duties and hours.

The Association of Collegiate Alumnæ had a membership of 5,404, located throughout the United States, representing, therefore, diversified household conditions ranging from the San Francisco home, with its inevitable Chinese man servant, to the "eight in help" in the home of the "effete East."

The following table shows the number of clubs and branches to which schedules were sent, their membership, the number of schedules mailed, the number returned, and percentage returned of those mailed:

Classification.	Federation of Women's Clubs	Association of Collegiate Alumnæ	Aggregates
Number of clubs and branches,	79	25	104
Total membership of clubs and branches,	15,572	5,404	20,976
Number of schedules mailed,	4,280	500	4,780
Number returned,	212	48	260
Percentage of schedules returned,	4.95	9.60	5.44

The 260 schedules were received from women living in the following States:

Massachusetts,	209	Wisconsin,	8
New Hampshire,	1	Minnesota,	1
Rhode Island,	2	Missouri,	2
Connecticut,	2	Nebraska,	1
New York,	19	California,	3
New Jersey,	1	District of Columbia,	4
Pennsylvania,	2		
Illinois,	5	Total,	260

These figures speak for themselves. They are eloquent of the lack of interest, either practical or academic, on the part of employers, whether club or college women, whether living in the East or the West.

The schedule was in two parts or sets of questions, the first relating to the inducements that might be offered to lead household employees to desire training. In introducing the first set of questions the schedule stated:

One of the first remedies for the domestic service situation that suggests itself is that of a training school, where houseworkers may be trained to do housework.

This experiment has been tried in a number of cities, and in the majority of cases it has been found that houseworkers themselves do not desire this training. The girls who come to a training school for houseworkers, are, in general, very young or in some way deficient, and they are usually sent by charitably inclined friends.

These being the facts, the question naturally arises: What inducements can be offered houseworkers that shall be so strong as to cause them to come, voluntarily, to a training school for housework? It is with the hope that employers will have some practical means to suggest that the following questions are asked.

The present scale of wages of household employees, compiled from actual statistics taken from the Union employment office, is as follows:

Weekly Wages of Household Employees — 1901, 1902.

Occupations.	Lowest Wage Paid	Highest Wage Paid	Average Wage Paid
Cooks,	$3.50	$10.00	$5.189
Second girls,	2.50	6.00	3.909
Parlor maids,	3.00	5.50	4.51
Chambermaids,	3.00	6.00	4.447
General houseworkers,	2.00	5.50	3.866

The following were the inquiries on the first section of the schedule:

1. Provided competent, trained service could be had, would you be willing to pay for it any more than you now pay for household service? If so, please indicate how much more you would be willing to pay.
2. Instead of giving a higher wage for trained service, would you prefer to give certain "privileges," such as shorter hours or definite free time each day? If so, please state what privileges you would wish to give.
3. What inducements would you suggest that should lead household employees, themselves, to desire training for the sake of its ultimate advantages?

The following represent the answers that were received to the first two inquiries:

Inquiries.	Yes	No	Not Stated	Total
Provided competent, trained service could be had, would you be willing to pay for it any more than you now pay for household service?	88	142	30	260
Percentages,	33.85	54.61	11.54	100.00
Instead of giving a higher wage for trained service, would you prefer to give certain "privileges," such as shorter hours or definite free time each day?	83	114	63	260
Percentages,	31.92	43.85	24.23	100.00

In answering the first inquiry, 88 employers, or 33.85 per cent, replied in the affirmative; 142, or 54.61 per cent, in the negative; while 30, or 11.54 per cent, did not reply to the inquiry.

To the second inquiry which asked if, instead of giving a higher wage for this trained service, employers would give

certain "privileges," such as shorter hours or definite free time each day, 83 employers, or 31.92 per cent, answered that they would; 114, or 43.85 per cent, replied that they would not; while 63, or 24.23 per cent, did not reply to the inquiry. Those employers who were willing to grant certain "privileges" to their employees, if they were trained, made reply as follows:

Privileges.	Number Replying	Percentages
More free time,	4	4.82
Shorter hours,	12	14.46
Shorter hours and more free time,	10	12.05
Definite free time each day,	42	50.60
Not specified,	15	18.07
Totals,	83	100.00

The advantages offered trained employees most frequently in the suggestions of employers represented, then, may be summarized as follows: More free time; shorter hours; shorter hours and more free time; and definite free time each day. These seem to be the most practicable suggestions and the only ones offered which are within the control of employers. Of the 83 women answering, four, or 4.82 per cent, were willing to give the servant more free time; 12, or 14.46 per cent, were willing to shorten the hours of labor; 10, or 12.05 per cent, would grant shorter hours and more free time; 42, or 50.60 per cent, were willing to give definite free time each day; and 15, or 18.07 per cent, did not state what privileges they would grant.

An inducement suggested by 36 employers was that a training school preparation would increase the dignity of housework; others believed that the positions of trained girls would be more permanent; others, that training would increase the employee's feeling of responsibility; seven persons thought that, should the employee subsequently have a home of her own, she would find a scientific training in housework of the greatest benefit; and free classes in Domestic Science were also mentioned as a possible attraction. Many inducements were suggested with apparently little study of the economic principles involved. One employer stated that she would offer prizes for excellent cooking, or laundry work, resulting from a course in a training school. This would practically amount

to higher wages. Another proposed that mistresses boycott untrained employees. This, with the existing condition of supply and demand, would undoubtedly result in the boycotting mistresses personally performing all the duties of their own households. Another so-called inducement was for employers to co-operate in employing only such girls as could present a certificate from a training school. The same reasoning applies to this suggestion as to its predecessor, and it also savors more of coercion than persuasion.

From employers who would offer more definite free time came the following specific suggestions: "Four hours per day;" "one afternoon and evening weekly;" "alternate Sundays;" "three evenings a week;" "two afternoons;" "Saturday evenings once a month;" "three evenings;" "one or two whole days off each month;" "one hour daily;" "two and one-half hours every afternoon but one;" "certain hours;" "two afternoons weekly;" "three or four days vacation occasionally;" "half the evenings in the week;" "one day a week."

Among the attempts made to answer the inquiry, "What inducements would you suggest that should lead household employees, themselves, to desire training for the sake of its ultimate advantages?" were the following:

121. The best servants can now command the best places and prices, though perhaps they do not dare to wait for them.

108. I think nothing would move them but higher wages for skilled work.

72. A little more praise from employers and also a little more consideration of their feelings *at times*.

155. As long as a girl "just over" can command $3.50 per week no "inducements" can avail.

65. The gradual rise to better position and higher pay. Good, permanent homes where they would receive respect. Greater ease and rapidity, and hence more time to rest.

61. None, unless you improve the whole human race, maids and mistresses alike, but the possibility of higher wages and a greater chance of steady employment.

203. The demand for trained service. Make it obligatory on the part of a domestic to show a certificate of having been to some training school, setting forth her capabilities.

94. I cannot offer any inducements, as I think if the employees cannot appreciate the advantage of training, it is not worth while to spend time in trying to persuade them.

71 Trained service must be better paid. Untrained service is too well paid at present. A trained servant must show her certificate from a training school, or from some member of a Domestic Reform League.

234. I think the scheme the German housekeepers of New York have made is the only one to give employees that *esprit de corps* which is so woefully lacking: A system

of increasing wages for better work given by the employers after servants have earned certificates.

105. The Union should procure orphans from the homes, with the idea of teaching them housework as a trade, assuring them that as they graduated they would find lucrative positions, and that there is always *money* in knowing anything *thoroughly*.

162. Standard of work required is not high enough and good wages are paid for poor work, so employees have no incentive to learn to do better work. Also, training schools so far have not given the kind of training that brings the highest wages.

150. If the employer would refuse to employ any person who had not been trained, the domestic problem would be solved, but employers lack courage, and at present employees with no training have no difficulty in obtaining situations and good wages.

76 First, above all, as a matter of conscience towards themselves and towards their employers. Second, because the higher the motive the better will be the results of their training and consequently the better fitted they will be for situations of trust.

129. No inducements at the present time that would appeal except higher wages and less time for work. In the years to come I think that higher incentives such as the acknowledgment of equal rights may be appreciated.

192. I think the general introduction of household science for girls in our public schools, for rich and poor, would do more in this line than any *inducement* I can think of. Mistresses would be less dependent and servants better qualified.

175. There can be no real inducements to offer while the demand exceeds the supply. If there were a good school for domestics and a fixed higher wage paid to those so trained, it might possibly bring about a desire for special training.

244. If possible, to teach them to consider it a trade, as much so as dressmaking or typewriting, and never speak of them as servants as is so often done in our papers. I have had maids from well-to-do families in the Provinces much hurt by newspaper items headed "The Servant Question."

116. The assurance of higher wages would probably be the greatest inducement, but if such trained workers felt that their social standard was elevated, that our present stigma of their position was removed by being allowed membership in working girls' clubs, etc., the desire to learn might be stimulated.

113. The pride they should take in doing good work for the good wages and home they receive. In the schools servant's work has been looked down upon, but when their work is respected then they, too, will take pride in their work just as any one should take pride in whatever profession they take up.

103. The fact that they live with people of higher refinement and education than themselves and feel that influence. That they are given a chance to learn order, system and economy, patience and forbearance, and thus better fitted to be themselves thrifty housekeepers. These two answers were learned from servants.

98. Under the present conditions when supply is not equal to demand, we pay often high wages to the incompetent. If the supply could be increased and high wages paid only to the trained worker, it would increase the desire for training, but I do not see how the supply *can* be increased. Can we import from China?

156. If the employer is willing to pay good wages and an employee is incompetent, although willing to do the work required, the employer should insist on sending her and paying for her to be trained, during hours when least needed in the house, with the promise of good wages as soon as her training shall result in satisfactory work.

53. I believe the trouble lies in the mistress who seldom has washed, ironed, cooked, or cleaned and who does not know the time or strength necessary for doing each properly. No business flourishes with ignorant people directing. The mistress's contempt for housework and her inability to do it seem to me to be at the bottom of the trouble.

186. The treatment of the employee as one of the family; in other words, the employment of persons of such grade and character that it is possible, in all respects, to make them members of the family. This, of course, applies principally to the cases where only one person is employed.

260. I consider that the lady of the house knows too little about actual housekeeping

and work. If she has money she will pay *anything* to be relieved of care. If she has no money she puts up with almost *anything* for the sake of keeping the household work in action and having her children cared for.

109. More reasonable demands from housekeepers. The maid says, "I cannot tend the door bell in a white apron when I am sifting ashes in the cellar, nor tend table and get work done in chambers and kitchen." The attempt is made and carried on, regardless of results, to manage a home with only one maid as a neighbor does with her two trained helpers. Daughters do not help about the house *now*.

145. I can think of no sufficient inducement for even free training that would require say a year's time, unless *possibly* the promise of exorbitant wages. I have heard of cooks for whom their employers had supplied a course of evening cooking lessons who would barely present themselves at the class and then leave, and others who would remain but pay no attention whatever to the instruction.

81. Knowledge that on the part of their employers they would receive the benefit of a more highly developed moral nature, *applying* the belief in *brotherhood*, thus enabling servants to have more comfortable and attractive surroundings; hours of service as definite as in a store; fewer hours of service, enabling employees to have more out-of-door life, with greater scope to their lives in every way.

194. After 25 years' experience with servants of all sorts and kinds, I have come to the solemn conclusion that the average servant girl has only two aims in life: One is to receive the highest possible wages for the least possible amount of work, and the other is to get *married*. If they could be persuaded that training schools would assist in the attainment of either of these objects, they might be induced to attend.

131. If the training were vouched for, as it would be if there were a certificate from a school, the employees might be given charge, held responsible, and so made more independent, not nagged by mistresses who know less than an efficient employee. I would have wages graded, then the *best* would receive more money and would be employed only in households where higher wages *could* be paid.

69. I think there is nothing that would induce them to *desire* such training. They prefer to learn and earn at the same time. This is natural, only the lady who has the trouble of teaching should pay low wages, and they should not venture to ask (as I have always found they do) the same wages as really competent servants. The only remedy I can suggest is that each lady, when a girl leaves her, should state at the office what wages her services are worth.

52. I am paying a girl $4 a week to cook, wash, and iron for two persons and a child She washes poorly and knows nothing about cooking but what I have taught her and allowed her to experiment. She wanted to earn $4 a week, and I took her because I had to have some one and considered her the most willing and sensible one I talked with; but she wasn't worth $2 a week and isn't to-day worth but $3, for she is not strong and has many dirty habits that have to be constantly watched.

58. I think no "inducements" toward training will avail while the great body of employers in this country do not *demand* good service. My experience shows me that there is little difficulty or complaint on either side in houses where skilled service is required and few, if any, "privileges" given. While employers in this country are willing, in great numbers, to pay high wages for unskilled and *disrespectful* service, I do not look for light on "the servant question."

188. I would make my house their home, sympathize with them in all things, do shopping for them if desired, and try to make them interested to *learn* to do their best for their own sakes. As they command higher wages if a diploma is given them, offer a girl a diploma and let her feel as if she was entitled to more respect with it than without it. Advise her to dress plainly (not like her mistress), save money, and *take vacations*.

151. I find that ladies are frequently not quite honest in their recommendations. They often recommend to others servants whom they would not keep themselves, thereby teaching employees that some place is always open to them, no matter how incompetent or unfaithful they are. One friend of mine says she never tells of a girl's faults, only of her virtues, because she wishes to make no enemies. I think if girls felt that only honest, faithful service secured a place a great gain would result.

Many of the so-called inducements to lead employees to enter training schools are irrelevant and immaterial, as the following quotations will show, "Human nature would need changing;" "need for less clothes." One woman, who would give neither higher wages nor more privileges, suggested "greater responsibilities" as an inducement. Another, "the desire to do the best that can be done." An ethical employer stated that she "would have greater respect for a girl who was trained." From another came the proposition to "employ only refined girls." "Work would be more interesting," said a third. "A trained girl," one housekeeper thought, "would rejoice in freedom from scolding and criticism." "She would have greater confidence," said another. A woman from a neighboring State exhorted her fellow club women to awaken the desire for skill "by your own example of excellence in work." A pessimist knew of no inducement "unless a new race of beings can be created." A conservative New Englander would offer "higher pay at the end of five years' service in one family." A western inducement was "more praise from employers." Three characteristic Bostonian inducements were, "to earn wages honestly;" "matter of pride;" "matter of conscience." The next four propositions suggested a copy-book origin. "Intelligence lessens drudgery;" "a clear conscience is its own inducement;" "self-respect and feeling of power;" "power to accomplish more work with complacency and intelligence." A fifth deserves special mention as being the most unintelligible. It reads: "I would offer no inducement; the demand is greater than the supply."

The personal note is in nearly every instance the dominant one, the majority of writers mentioning no experiences other than their own. There is no suggestion of a desire to promote the welfare of sister employers or employees; but, as a rule, each housekeeper is absorbed in the aspect presented by her own problem.

Some of these suggestions are entirely meaningless, and they are for the most part characterized by individual variations and idiosyncrasies. It is apparent that none of the employees would have the same free time, owing to the lack of a common standard among employers. It is not to be wondered at that young women prefer the shop and the factory rather than domestic service. The shop girl's hours may be long, her work hard, and her home conditions indifferent, but she can at least count on some definite free time, as her hours are regulated by law, and not by caprice. The domestic worker, even if her mistress does agree to give her "one afternoon a week," is often not left in uninterrupted possession of one *regular* afternoon off, for she is frequently expected to adapt her time to the varying engagements of her mistress. The factory worker's afternoons and evenings are often dreary, but they are not sacrificed to the "at homes," receptions, or afternoon teas of her employers.

It would seem, from the comments of employers on the suggestions embodied in the first set of inquiries, that the domestic problem is due, first, to the scarcity of employees and the consequent high wage, and, second, to the incompetency of such employees as are obtainable. It is also evident, from the very nature of domestic service, which is becoming more and more a stepping-stone to other things, the factory, shop, manicure parlor, and, possibly, even marriage itself, that houseworkers will continue to be untrained and incompetent, and that unless human nature is changed, there must be some practical inducement for an employee to take training before she will attempt it, yet many employers consulted did not see the necessity of offering any inducement more tangible than "a desire to do the best that can be done," an inducement that would scarcely prove sufficient even for a person in the "pink" of moral condition. The majority of inducements to enter training schools, as above set forth, would presuppose a moral athlete, or, at least, an inherited New England conscience.

A glance at the nationalities of the girls who registered for domestic work in the Domestic Reform League shows, however, that the American-born girls are becoming less and less inclined to engage in housework, and that the supply, as time goes on, must be drawn from nations whose standards of living differ from the American standard and who are, therefore, more than ever in need of special training. The following table shows the percentage of nationalities for 1899 and 1904:

Nationalities of Employees Registered in the Domestic Reform League for this Work.

Nationalities.	Percentages 1899	Nationalities.	Percentages 1904
American,	22.0	American,	19.0
Irish,	39.0	Irish,	39.0
Canadian,	22.0	Canadian and Provinces,	21.0
Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian,	5.0	Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian,	7.0
German,	1.0	German,	1.0
French,	1.0	French,	1.0
English, Welsh, and Scotch,	6.0	English and Scotch,	5.0
Other nationalities,	3.0	Other nationalities,	5.0
Colored,	1.0	Colored,	2.0
Total,	100.0	Total,	100.0

Supplemental Workers.

The second set of questions in the schedule considered whether or not it was possible to have a part of the housework done by persons living outside the house, and to ascertain this fact the following remarks preceded the inquiries:

One way sometimes suggested to solve the domestic service problem is to have all or some of the household employees live out of the house and come in by the hour or day.

Of course, such an arrangement could not be brought about suddenly; it must come, if it comes at all, as a result of slow change and growth and could only be perfected by adapting houses and methods of housework to meet the change. In its final development it would have to be accompanied by alterations in house-plans, by a broader development of the possibilities of preparing food out of the house, and by a less rigid adherence to customs and fixed rules within the household.

It is hardly probable that at any time, so long as the individual home stands, the individual housekeeper could, in every instance, hire all her household labor done by persons living outside her house. Particularly where there are small children in the family, it would probably be necessary to hire some one who should live in the house. But is it not possible that at least a portion of the work now done by employees living in the house might be done equally well by persons coming in by the hour or day? Where several maids are kept, might it not be possible to do away with the services of one or two, provided their work could be supplemented by labor from outside? And, in time, might not the employer of the general housework girl find it simpler, with the help of outside labor, laundries, and prepared food, to do away entirely with this frequently incompetent and irritating "Jack-of-all-trades" who is master of none? In this case, might not the want of some one competent to "answer the bell" and relieve the housekeeper from the necessity of being tied down to her house at all hours, be met by hiring some young and intelligent person, for example some student, to come in for stated hours of the day to do this task?

Under the existing state of affairs the actual cost of labor hired from outside would be greater than is the cost where employees live in the house. However, the present expense would be much decreased if there were a sufficient demand for the preparation of food and the washing of clothes outside the house to warrant their being done on a larger scale than at present. Also, the apparent difference in cost of laborers living in the house or hired from outside is greater than the actual difference; for the living expenses of an employee in the house are generally overlooked, and the cost of "wear and tear" for which she is responsible is commonly disregarded. Both living expenses and

wear and tear would be diminished, at least in part, or entirely eliminated in the case of an employee coming in by the hour. Even were the employee to come in by the day, living expenses would be reduced and wear and tear would be lessened, because it is assumed that her work would be increasingly supplemented by outside agencies such as laundries and prepared food.

Three facts noted within the last few years would seem to indicate that there is already a tendency setting in the direction of removal of the domestic employee from the house of her employer. These facts are:

First: An increase in the amount of washing sent out of the house to laundries.
Second: An increase both in amount and kinds of food prepared out of the house.
Third: An increasing demand in employment offices for "extra service," "accommodators"—for women, particularly cleaners, to go out by the day or hour.

In view of these facts, the Union wished to know whether such a suggestion as that of hiring a portion of the housework done by persons living outside the house would seem practicable to experienced housekeepers, and earnestly asked that they give it the benefit of their experience and mature judgment by answering the following questions:

1. So far as time and convenience are concerned, could you arrange to have any of your housework—*e.g.*, cooking, cleaning, laundry work, table serving, chamberwork—done by helpers coming in from outside by the day or hour?

2. Provided there were no difference in expense, how much of your housework could you now hire done by outside workers?

3. What kind of work—*i.e.*, cleaning, washing, cooking, chamberwork—would you have done by outside help?

4. How many hours per week would you employ outside helpers?

5. On what days of the week would you wish them to come?

6. At what hours of the day would it be most convenient for you to have them?

7. Could you arrange to have them at other hours than those preferred?

8. Could you, by employing sufficient outside help, do away with one or more employees living in your house?

9. Provided there were no difference in expense, would you be willing to make such a change? If not willing, please state reasons.

10. Does the following estimate of the cost of a household employee to her employer over and above her wage seem to you a fair one?

a. Cost of food, per week,	$2.00
b. Cost of heat, light and laundry ("rent," available space occupied in the house, is not counted) per week,	.50
c. Wear and tear on household utensils and waste due to ignorance or carelessness per week,	1.00
Total per week,	$3.50

If this statement does not seem to you fair, please state what you consider a fair estimate for the different items of expense given:

a. Cost of food, ...
b. Cost of heat, light, laundry, ...
c. Wear and tear and waste, ...

11. If you are willing to do so, state the amount you now pay per week for household service and the number of houseworkers you employ. Does

this include laundry work or any other outside help? If so, specify what outside help is included.

12. If in the light of your own experience it seems to you impossible, either now or in the future, to substitute help from outside for the employees living in the house, please state reasons leading you to this conclusion.

The above inquiries, which deal with the matter of supplementing or superseding the work of the house by the employment of outside help, evidently excited more interest among employers than the first set, which was devoted to the possibility of training schools for domestic helpers. Obtaining supplemental workers was regarded as more practicable than obtaining trained workers. The college woman's attitude toward outside help seems more plastic and hopeful than that of the club woman. The latter believes that outside help could be utilized to a certain extent, but, possibly owing to longer experience, she is less confident of the reliability, punctuality, and efficiency of any worker not directly under her personal supervision.

The number of employers who said that they could arrange to have certain kinds of their household work done by helpers coming in from the outside was 164, or 63.08 per cent; 51, or 19.61 per cent, replied that they could not so arrange their household duties; and 45, or 17.31 per cent, declined to answer the inquiry.

The number of employers having all the duties of the household performed by resident employees was 56, or 21.54 per cent; those having work done by employees in the house with some outside assistance, 174, or 66.92 per cent; those having all work done by non-resident employees, 19, or 7.31 per cent; and 11, or 4.23 per cent, did not reply.

The most popular services rendered exclusively by non-resident workers are cleaning, washing or ironing, or both, and care of furnace. Chore-men who clean windows, beat rugs, care for lawns, walks, etc., were very commonly employed.

Out of a total of 260 women, 221, or 85 per cent, replied that they could arrange to have some or all of their housework done by outside help, provided there was no increase in the expense; 203 employers could have laundry work done; 177, cleaning; 58, cooking; 30, parlor work; 23, second work; 21, general housework; and six, nursery work.

In answering the inquiry as to the number of hours a week outside helpers would be employed, the following varying answers were received:

How Many Hours per Week Would You Employ Outside Helpers?

Number of Hours.	Number Answering	Number of Hours.	Number Answering
3 hours,	1	30 hours,	15
4 hours,	1	32 hours,	2
5 hours,	2	40 hours,	9
6 hours,	6	44 hours,	1
8 hours,	5	46 hours,	1
9 hours,	2	48 hours,	4
10 hours,	8	56 hours,	2
11 hours,	10	60 hours,	4
14 hours,	4	72 hours,	2
15 hours,	4	80 hours,	1
16 hours,	3	Indefinite,	46
18 hours,	5	None,	5
20 hours,	11	Not stated,	91
24 hours,	14		
27 hours,	1	Total,	260

The hours designated for employing outside helpers were extremely varied.

From the replies to the query, "On what days of the week would you employ outside helpers?" a great variety of answers was received, as will be seen by the following table:

On What Days of the Week Would You Employ Outside Helpers?

Days of the Week.	Number Answering	Days of the Week.	Number Answering
Every day,	37	Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday,	1
Monday,	4	Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday,	1
Friday,	3	Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday,	2
Monday and Tuesday,	7	Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Saturday,	3
Monday and Wednesday,	1	Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday,	2
Monday and Thursday,	1	Monday, Tuesday, Friday, and Saturday,	4
Monday and Friday,	8	Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday,	1
Monday and Saturday,	3	Tuesday, Wednesday, Saturday, and Sunday,	1
Tuesday and Wednesday,	1	Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday,	1
Tuesday and Friday,	2	Indefinite,	54
Tuesday and Saturday,	1	None,	2
Wednesday and Thursday,	2	Not stated,	88
Wednesday and Saturday,	1		
Thursday and Friday,	2		
Thursday and Saturday,	1		
Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday,	2		
Monday, Tuesday, and Friday,	16		
Monday, Tuesday, and Saturday,	2		
Monday, Wednesday, and Friday,	4		
Monday, Thursday, and Saturday,	1		
Monday, Friday, and Saturday,	1	Total,	260

Thirty-seven employers wanted outside helpers during every day of the week; seven wished them on only one day; 30, for two days; 28, three days; 13, four days; and one, five days.

Two employers desired no outside help, while 54, or 20.77 per cent, returned very indefinite replies, and 88, or 33.85 per cent, did not answer.

Almost as great a variety of differences of opinions was received in response to the inquiry, "At what hours of the day would it be most convenient for you to have them come?"

At What Hours of the Day Would It Be Most Convenient for You to Have Them Come?

Classification.	Number Answering	Percentages
All day,	46	17.69
Forenoon,	75	28.85
Evening,	1	0.39
Mid-day,	1	0.39
Early forenoon and late afternoon,	8	3.07
Forenoon and part of afternoon,	15	5.77
Indefinite,	20	7.69
Not stated,	94	36.15
Total,	260	100.00

If outside helpers were engaged exclusively in the forenoons, as the above replies would seem to indicate, there would certainly appear to be no lack of "definite free time" for the outside help, no matter how it affected those living in the houses in which they were employed.

When the question was asked whether or not work could be so arranged that the outside helpers might come at other times than those preferred, 64, or 24.61 per cent, replied in the affirmative; 49, or 18.85 per cent, in the negative; 41, or 15.77 per cent, thought "possibly" it could be so arranged; and 106, or 40.77 per cent, did not answer.

Ninety-nine women, or 38.08 per cent of those replying thought that by employing sufficient outside help they could dispense with the one or more employees at present living in the house; 113, or 43.46 per cent, did not believe they could get along with less inside service; and 48, or 18.46 per cent, did not have an opinion either way, judging from the fact that they did not reply. Ninety, or 34.62 per cent, of the employers would be willing to make such a change, provided it did not cost more, but 123, or 47.31 per cent, would not make the change even though it were less expensive, many of them from the fact that they did not believe it was possible to

get along with a less number of servants than they already had.

Among the replies to the inquiry, "Provided there were no difference in expense, would you be willing to make such a change? If not willing, please state reasons" are the following, some of them rather strong and pertinent reasons:

73. Forty-two years' experience as housekeeper has taught me that help from outside has made much mischief with the regular servants.

240. No. I have tried two instead of three indoor employees and find I can give more privileges and run my domestic machine more smoothly with three.

227. I think outside help upsets the regularity of one's household. They are more independent and are inclined to make the girls think they are doing too much; in short, cause a restlessness.

239. I doubt if I should. My objections would be, first, that there must be always a degree of uncertainty as to these employees coming up to the terms of agreement — they disappoint; and, second, the extra opportunity for leakage through the back door, already quite an item.

258. Most certainly not. Should never have the same interest in the welfare of "outside help" as in the help living under my roof. Am very sure my servants are better lodged and fed than they would be outside my house.

231. I should not be happy if people whose life and principal interests were elsewhere were coming into my house to work. I don't think humanity, as a whole, is naturally honest enough to bear the temptations, and besides I want the love as well as respect of my help.

103. No. Any radical change in the system which is the result of many generations' experience would inevitably involve loss. There appears to be too much deference to the criticisms and opinions of uneducated servants.

72. Not willing because outside helpers have their own home interests, which take their strength, and they come to work tired. Also on account of small losses which are almost inevitable if the thing is done continuously.

50. I believe in letting well enough alone — wish other people would do the same — and then would come back the day of contented help and happy kitchens — less trained humanity and more competent humanity. A true woman soon learns to run a house and manage her own help.

52. Objections: The carrying of filth and disease. You can make a girl who lives in your house keep fairly clean and you don't feed her on onions. Girls whom I have tried for "outside help" need baths and different food.

250. Not unless I could get better service. The reason is simply a preference to have a good home under my roof for as many persons as possible. Also the conditions in most homes in which the girls otherwise live are not likely to be favorable to their development as neat and efficient servants.

177. Only for laundry work. I think work should be done in a systematic manner by servants in the house; the trouble has come from too much leniency on the part of the housekeeper in employing outside helpers. In the end they really make more work and more trouble by coming into the house.

68. I should not be willing. A person who has been with a family some time has an interest in that family and its affairs, and mutual affection brings the best service. A servant should feel that she has a friend in her employer and a home in her service, which, to a lonely girl, means much.

116. No. There would doubtless be confusion in dealing with several different workers. In case of the frequent changes in plans from day to day (social engagements at different hours), it would be much more difficult to arrange with workers, co-operative kitchens, etc., than with one maid.

234. Should be willing except for the fact that experience has taught me it is almost impossible to get perfectly honest outside workers. The laundresses almost invariably take soap, borax, bread, or tea, if not small articles of clothing. This is very exasperating as well as expensive. They are also apt to make trouble with the permanent servants, interfering with or unsettling them in one way or another.

76. By no means. I consider it a demoralizing arrangement. It would go far toward breaking up the *entente cordiale* which should exist between masters and servants. In my opinion the family bond which does exist, in greater or less degree, between the two classes is worth maintaining. The mistress of a household would become much more exacting, the servant far less interested in the service of her employer.

174. I much prefer all the work of my household to be done by people living in the house, particularly the laundry work, for economic and hygienic reasons. It seems highly impracticable to me to do away with keeping employees in the house *when they can be afforded*. There are many emergencies, such as illness or unexpected guests, when to be without them would be enough to give the average housekeeper an attack of nervous prostration.

81. I desire servants in the house to answer the bell in the hours when an employee by the day would have left, and for numberless conveniences, for attention in illness or emergencies, or small matters. With an elderly person, or small children, it seems to me indispensable to have servants in the house as residents. I also think that food prepared in the house, according to individual tastes, is infinitely more attractive than that prepared outside. This might not seem so impossible in an apartment as in a country house.

151. I shall never employ outside help except when absolutely necessary. I have great fear of vermin being brought into the house, having had a sad experience in that line. I think there is also danger of contagion. A helper by the day tries to do her work well, usually, but has not the same interest in the work or in economizing materials as a house helper. In time of illness, it is a great comfort to have the same women in the house from day to day and not to be dependent on outside helpers who might fail because of the weather, from illness at home, or other causes.

134. I should not be willing for the following reasons: The constant coming and going of the "professionals" would make confusion in the house, and more care for the housekeeper. It would afford greater opportunities for raids on the larder and housekeeping stores, and add quite a good deal to the work and discomfort of the home servants. Outside help would not be so reliable, the temptation to take "a day off" would be greater, and everything would be more at sixes and sevens. We couldn't have the same hold on and influence over them as when their home is with us, and they would not have any special interest in us. We could not know where or how they spent their time when away, and they might be the medium of introducing diseases into the home and we should be kept in a constant worry.

53. In hiring nurse girls from outside I have found these difficulties: Lack of punctuality, owing to laziness in some cases, to home duties in other cases. I have had them bring in vermin and take out baby pins. I was unable to insist on baths being taken. In hiring one person in for cleaning, another to tend the door evenings, etc., how would you ever know who had broken, who had stolen, who had mislaid? I can't imagine anything more uncomfortable than having numerous helpers with latch keys to your house, with constant anxiety as to their coming when you are out or not coming in time to let you go out. Then if the children had the measles one would be deprived of all outside help on account of contagion, and when one most needed to have all one's strength for nursing or helping nurse, one would have to go into the kitchen to cook. Again if the cook is sick in the night in your house, she calls you in time so that breakfast is not unnecessarily delayed. If in her own home, you would be notified perhaps by nine o'clock.

69. Judging from the experience of many long years, I consider it impossible and demoralizing in almost every case. In almost every home there are children, often very young children. It is for them mainly, or should be, that the home and the household exist. Then there are old people and invalids to be considered also. Apart from

this, were the work done chiefly from the outside, it follows that *character* would be largely ignored. When helpers live under your own roof, you know in the main how their leisure time is spent and who their associates are. You know that they sleep in wholesome places, and are not likely to bring disease or moral contamination into the house, as would be possible where two or three came daily from the outside. It is also far better for their own character to come under the influence of a good home. They are also saved the expense of lodging. There would be no saving of food. Each girl would expect to get her meals where she worked. Those ladies most liberal and generous in providing would then feed the whole crowd. It would be worse than at present in that respect.

The employers making the change would arrange, in most instances, to do away with a resident laundress, and the next greatest number would have cleaning performed by an outsider; 37 would dispense with a resident cook, 22 with a parlor maid, 16 with the maid-of-all-work, and 15 with the second maid.

The following tabulation of answers to the question of living expenses of employees throws light on a phase of the domestic problem which is seldom considered by the employee, and too seldom by the employer.

Living Expenses and Wages Paid.

Number of Employees.	Cost per Employer for—			Total Cost per Family for Employees		
	Food	Heat, Light, and Laundry	Wear and Tear and Waste	Living	Wages	Total
One,	$2.00	$0.50	$1.00	$3.50	$7.00	$10.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	7.00	10.50
One,	2.00	0.50	0.25	2.75	3.29	6.04
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.33	6.83
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.75	7.25
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.26	6.76
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.10	5.60
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	3.71	6.71
One,	2.00	0.50	2.00	4.50	4.00	8.50
One,	1.50	0.50	0.50	2.50	2.50	5.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.25	6.75
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	3.50	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	5.00	8.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	5.00	8.50
One,	1.00	0.25	0.25	1.50	3.50	5.00
One,	2.00	1.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	8.00
One,	1.25	0.25	0.50	2.00	2.50	4.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.25	6.75
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.75	6.25
One,	2.00	0.25	0.75	3.00	2.50	5.50
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	4.00	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.50	6.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.50	6.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.75	4.25	2.80	7.05
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.87	6.37
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.50	6.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.75	8.25
One,	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	8.00

Living Expenses and Wages Paid — Continued.

Number of Employees.	Cost per Employee for—			Total Cost per Family for Employees		
	Food	Heat, Light, and Laundry	Wear and Tear and Waste	Living	Wages	Total
One,	$2.00	$1.50	$1.00	$4.50	$4.00	$8.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	9.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.20	7.70
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.25	0.50	2.75	3.50	6.25
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.25	7.75
One,	2.00	0.40	0.25	2.65	4.00	6.65
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	5.50	9.00
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	5.00	8.00
One,	2.00	–	–	2.00	4.25	6.25
One,	3.00	0.50	1.00	4.50	4.00	8.50
One,	3.00	0.75	1.75	5.50	4.50	10.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.50	8.00
One,	3.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	4.50	9.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	1.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	9.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	1.50	0.50	0.50	2.50	4.00	6.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.50	6.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	5.00	8.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.75	7.25
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	3.00	0.50	1.50	5.00	4.50	9.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.25	6.75
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	5.00	8.00
One,	2.00	1.00	1.50	4.50	4.50	9.00
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	4.00	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	4.00	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.25	0.50	2.75	4.00	6.75
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.50	0.25	0.50	3.25	4.50	7.75
One,	4.00	0.50	0.25	4.75	4.25	9.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.35	0.50	2.85	4.00	6.85
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	0.10	2.60	4.00	6.60
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	1.50	0.25	0.60	2.35	4.00	6.35
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.25	6.75
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	4.00	7.00
One,	1.59	0.50	0.75	2.84	3.00	5.84
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.50	8.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.50	1.00	0.50	4.00	4.00	8.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	4.00	7.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	5.00	8.50
One,	3.00	1.00	2.00	6.00	4.00	10.00
One,	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.50
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.50

Living Expenses and Wages Paid — Continued.

Number of Employees.	Cost per Employee for—			Total Cost per Family for Employees		
	Food	Heat, Light, and Laundry	Wear and Tear and Waste	Living	Wages	Total
One,	$2.00	$0.50	$1.00	$3.50	$3.50	$7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	2.00	4.50	4.50	9.00
One,	3.00	–	2.00	5.00	5.00	10.00
One,	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00	4.00	7.00
One,	3.00	0.50	1.50	5.00	4.00	9.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	7.00
One,	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	2.50	6.00
One,	1.50	–	0.50	2.00	3.50	5.50
Two,	2.00	1.50	1.00	9.00	8.75	17.75
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	5.75	12.75
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	7.91	14.91
Two,	2.00	1.00	1.00	8.00	8.00	16.00
Two,	5.00	1.00	–	12.00	11.00	23.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	10.00	17.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	3.00	11.00	8.50	19.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.50	15.50
Two,	3.50	0.50	1.00	10.00	7.25	17.25
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.00	15.00
Two,	3.00	0.50	1.00	9.00	7.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.50	6.00	7.00	13.00
Two,	5.00	1.00	4.00	20.00	8.75	28.75
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.75	15.75
Two,	2.50	0.50	1.00	8.00	10.00	18.00
Two,	2.75	0.75	1.00	9.00	8.25	17.25
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	3.50	1.00	1.00	11.00	8.00	19.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.00	15.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.50	6.00	11.00	17.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.50	6.00	9.00	15.00
Two,	4.00	0.50	1.00	11.00	9.00	20.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.50	15.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	9.25	19.25
Two,	2.75	0.50	1.00	8.50	9.50	18.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.50	1.00	2.00	11.00	8.50	19.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.50	15.50
Two,	2.50	0.35	0.75	7.20	9.00	16.20
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	4.50	2.00	2.00	17.00	9.00	26.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.35	15.35
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	10.50	17.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.50	6.00	6.50	12.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.50	6.00	8.50	14.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	2.00	9.00	8.25	17.25
Two,	3.00	0.50	1.00	9.00	8.25	17.25
Two,	3.00	0.50	1.00	9.00	9.00	18.00
Two,	3.00	0.50	1.25	9.50	8.00	17.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.25	5.50	8.67	14.17
Two,	4.00	2.00	2.00	16.00	8.00	24.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.50	16.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	7.50	14.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.50	15.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.25	0.50	5.50	8.00	13.50
Two,	2.50	0.50	1.00	8.00	8.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	10.50	17.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	6.00	13.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	9.00	19.00
Two,	3.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	11.00	21.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.00	15.00
Two,	2.50	0.50	1.00	8.00	9.50	17.50
Two,	3.25	0.50	1.00	9.50	7.00	16.50
Two,	3.25	0.50	1.00	9.50	9.50	19.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.00	15.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	7.75	14.75
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	7.00	14.00

Living Expenses and Wages Paid — Concluded.

Number of Employees.	Cost per Employee for—			Total Cost per Family for Employees		
	Food	Heat, Light, and Laundry	Wear and Tear and Waste	Living	Wages	Total
Two,	$2.50	$0.50	$1.00	$8.00	$13.12	$21.12
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	7.00	14.00
Two,	3.50	0.50	1.00	10.00	9.00	19.00
Two,	2.75	1.00	1.00	9.50	10.00	19.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.50	16.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.50	15.50
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	9.00	16.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.00	15.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.50	6.00	9.00	15.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	0.50	6.00	11.00	17.00
Two,	2.00	0.50	1.00	7.00	8.75	15.75
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	14.00	24.50
Three,	2.50	1.00	0.50	12.00	13.50	25.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	13.00	23.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	14.00	24.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	13.50	24.00
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	14.50	25.00
Three,	2.00	0.50	0.50	9.00	12.00	21.00
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	13.50	24.00
Three,	2.50	0.75	1.25	13.50	14.00	27.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	–	7.50	14.20	21.70
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	13.00	23.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	13.00	23.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	18.00	28.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	0.15	7.95	15.00	22.95
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	17.00	27.50
Three,	2.50	0.50	1.50	13.50	17.00	30.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	14.50	25.00
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	13.00	23.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	12.50	23.00
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	10.50	21.00
Three,	1.50	0.25	0.75	7.50	13.62	21.12
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	13.50	24.00
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	12.00	22.50
Three,	2.50	1.00	1.00	13.50	15.00	28.50
Three,	2.00	0.50	1.00	10.50	17.00	27.50
Three,	2.50	0.50	1.00	12.00	13.50	25.50
Three,	3.00	0.75	1.00	14.25	14.00	28.25
Four,	2.00	0.50	1.00	14.00	22.50	36.50
Four,	2.00	0.50	1.00	14.00	24.50	38.50
Four,	2.00	0.50	1.00	14.00	22.00	36.00
Four,	2.50	0.25	0.50	13.00	18.00	31.00
Four,	2.00	0.50	1.00	14.00	20.00	34.00
Four,	3.00	0.50	1.00	18.00	22.00	40.00
Four,	4.00	0.50	1.00	22.00	20.00	42.00
Four,	3.50	0.50	0.75	19.00	17.50	36.50
Four,	2.00	0.50	1.00	14.00	20.00	34.00
Five,	2.00	0.50	1.00	17.50	23.33⅓	40.83⅓
Five,	3.50	0.50	0.50	22.50	25.00	47.50
Five,	4.00	0.75	0.25	25.00	25.50	50.50
Five,	4.00	0.50	1.00	27.50	34.67	62.17
Five,	2.00	0.50	1.00	17.50	28.00	45.50
Seven,	2.00	0.50	1.00	24.50	45.00	69.50
Eight,	4.50	0.50	1.00	48.00	64.33⅓	112.33⅓
Totals,	$521.59	$130.35	$227.60	$1,642.69	$1,913.76⅔	$3,556.45⅔

The preceding table shows the cost for each employee for food, heat, light, laundry, wear and tear and waste, in the 234 families supplying figures in answer to this inquiry. The table is arranged to show families employing from one servant up to eight. The first column shows the estimated cost for each employee for food; the second, the cost for each employee for heat, light, and laundry; and the third column, the cost for

each employee for wear and tear and waste. The fourth column shows the total cost of these estimated living expenses for one employee, two employees, etc. The last three columns of the table indicate the total cost per family for employees for living expenses and wages.

In the following recapitulation, we bring forward the total itemized cost of all employees in the 234 families replying:

Recapitulation: Total Cost of All Employees.

Number of Employees.	Number of Employers	Cost of Food	Heat, Light, and Laundry	Wear and Tear and Waste	Total Living Expenses	Wages Paid	Total Cost of Employees
One employee,	114	$233.84	$60.75	$108.70	$403.29	$432.81	$836.10
Two employees,	77	371.50	93.70	160.50	625.70	670.30	1,296.00
Three employees,	27	171.00	44.25	73.95	289.20	378.32	667.52
Four employees,	9	92.00	17.00	33.00	142.00	186.50	328.50
Five employees,	5	77.50	13.75	35.75	110.00	136.50⅓	246.50⅓
Seven employees,	1	14.00	3.50	7.00	24.50	45.00	69.50
Eight employees,	1	36.00	4.00	8.00	48.00	64.33⅓	112.33⅓
Totals,	234	$995.84	$236.95	$409.90	$1,642.69	$1,913.76⅔	$3,556.45⅔

This recapitulation may be read as follows: Of the families answering the inquiry as to the cost of living and wages, 77 employed two maids, making a total of 154 maids. It was estimated that the total living expenses for these 154 employees were $625.70, including $371.50 for food, $93.70 for heat, light, and laundry, and $160.50 for wear and tear and waste. These employees received $670.30 in wages, making the total cost of 154 employees in the 77 families, $1,296. Other lines may be read in a similar manner.

Exclusive of wages, these 234 families paid $1,642.69 for the living expenses of those persons employed by them, made up as follows: $995.84 for food, $236.95 for heat, light, and laundry, and $409.90 for wear and tear and waste. The aggregate amount paid in cash for wages by these 234 families was $1,913.76⅔; the total cost of all employees in the 234 families, $3,556.45⅔. Thus it will be seen that of the total amount of expense incurred for domestic service, the families paid in cash to their help 53.81 per cent, and the expense of keeping these servants in the house was 46.19 per cent.

The following table reduces the above recapitulation of total cost of all employees to an average per capita cost of each employee:

Recapitulation: Average per Capita Cost of Each Employee.

Classification.	Number of Employees	Average Cost per Employee for—					Total Average Cost per Employee
		Food	Heat, Light, and Laundry	Wear and Tear and Waste	Living	Wages	
One employee,	114	$2.05	$0.55	$0.96	$3.54	$3.80	$7.33
Two employees,	154	2.41	0.61	1.05	4.06	4.35	8.41
Three employees,	81	2.11	0.55	0.92	3.57	4.67	8.24
Four employees,	36	2.55	0.47	0.92	3.94	5.18	9.12
Five employees,	25	3.10	0.55	0.75	4.40	5.46	9.86
Seven employees,	7	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	6.43	9.93
Eight employees,	8	4.50	0.50	1.00	6.00	8.04	14.04
Totals,	425	$2.34	$0.56	$0.97	$3.87	$4.50	$8.37

This table shows that in the 234 families represented, there were 425 employees, and that the total average per capita cost of living was $3.87 per week, made up as follows: Food, $2.34; heat, light, and laundry, 56 cents; wear and tear and waste, 97 cents. The average weekly wage was $4.50, making the total average per capita cost to the householder $8.37 per week.

This indicates that not all the householder's expenses are included when she pays her help the wages contracted for in cash. It has cost her $3.87 to keep the servant in food, heat, laundry, and other incidentals, so that of the total average cost per employee ($8.37), 54 per cent is cash in the form of wages, and 46 per cent is in the form of living expenses, which the employee would have to pay elsewhere for her own accommodation.

The next recapitulation shows the maximum, minimum, and average wages paid per week, the average living expenses per week, and the total average weekly cost of employees.

Recapitulation.

Classification.	Number of Employees	Wages Paid per Week			Average Living Expenses	Average Cost of Employees
		Maximum	Minimum	Average		
One employee,	114	$7.00	$2.10	$3.80	$3.54	$7.33
Two employees,	154	13.12	5.75	8.70	8.12	16.82
Three employees,	81	18.00	10.50	14.01	10.71	24.72
Four employees,	36	24.50	17.50	20.72	15.76	36.48
Five employees,	25	34.67	23.33⅓	27.30	22.00	49.30
Seven employees,	7	45.00	45.00	45.01	24.50	69.51
Eight employees,	8	64.33⅓	64.33⅓	64.32	48.00	112.32

Considering the line showing 154 employees working in the 77 families which employ two persons in household work, it is seen that the maximum wages paid for the two employees were $13.12; the minimum, $5.75; and the average, $8.70, or $4.35

for each person. The average cost of living for each of these employees was almost as high as the average wages paid. On an average the two employees in the 77 families cost each family $8.70 for wages and $8.12 for living expenses, making a total cost to each householder for domestic service of $16.82 for two employees for one week. Other lines may be read in a similar manner.

The summary of these tables shows that, while the domestic employee looks upon the amount of money she receives as being her wage, and while the employer also looks upon the wage as being the cost of her employee, both have failed to reckon the cost of living. The average cost of food is $2.34; average cost of heat, light, and laundry, $0.56; average wear and tear and waste, $0.97, making the average living expenses of the domestic employee $3.87. This makes the average cost of the domestic employee to her employer almost twice as great as her average wage.

Compared with her sisters in the industrial field, the houseworker certainly is well compensated. One of the employers commenting on this fact that sufficient consideration was not given to the cost of living of the household employee, said: "We paid for board and lodging during the special training for a school teacher in a State Normal School in Massachusetts about $300 a year for three years. This student is now earning $7 a week teaching a country school. Out of this she pays $4 a week for board, leaving $3. A houseworker untrained, who is paid $3 or $3.50 per week besides her board, is surely well paid in comparison."

The final inquiry on the schedule asked, "If in the light of your own experience it seems to you impossible, either now or in the future, to substitute help from outside for the employees living in the house, please state reasons leading you to this conclusion." Sixty-six, or 25 per cent, of the employers answered in the affirmative, and 116, or 45 per cent, answered in the negative. Among the reasons given by the 45 per cent for not employing outside help was that the care of children and the answering of door bells required constant service. Forty-four employers were content to say that they could not employ outsiders "because they could not." Lack of reliability in outside workers was given as a reason by 46

women; lack of mutual interest, by 34; increase of care for housekeepers, by 38; 21 were satisfied with the present arrangement; 18 others felt that it would be difficult to arrange hours regularly; 18 others deplored the bad effect which living outside would have on employees; 17 stated, "At present outside workers are of a poor class." Danger of contagion, etc., due to unsanitary homes, was the reason given by 17 persons; 15 felt the difficulty of reaching outside workers when wanted; nine feared that outside workers would be apt to rob their employers; eight gave as a reason for rejecting the possibility of such a change the bad effect of outside employees on the resident ones; five women thought they could not endure "the annoyance of continual coming and going;" four gave as a reason that home interests would take the time and strength of non-resident employees.

Some of the answers are given more in detail as follows:

26. It seems easily possible and preferable to me except in case of nursemaid. I also think that one servant should always be in the house, but this could be arranged if several are regularly employed. I believe, however, that entirely outside help would place more responsibility upon the housekeeper, but she would be compensated by better results.

37. One can have more influence for good over servants by having them live in the home, also can teach them many things beside housework, like keeping their clothes in repair, etc. I even taught one servant to read and write, and she never trespassed beyond her place. She lived with me seven years until she married.

174. I see nothing to be gained by the plan suggested. It strikes me as being a most inconvenient manner of keeping house. I am afraid the plan will never be adopted by those who can afford to keep competent service in the house. I also think that housework in a private family where comfortable room and food is supplied the very best form of employment that young women can undertake.

87. There will be no solution of the problem until two things are assured: The mistress much watch over, care for, and *feel* a personal interest in the girls in her kitchen, and the girls must feel as much interest in their work and their mistress as if it were their own home. They must put themselves in each other's places. Therefore, to have the best results they *must* live together.

24. It would depend whether available helpers could be secured who would be willing to come in each morning in time to prepare breakfast and leave after the dishes for the evening meal were put away for the same wages as now paid to helpers in the house doing practically the same work. This does not seem to me possible, save when the servant for family reasons prefers to go to her own home at night.

64. Not *impossible*, but an added difficulty for the housekeeper. Work is more regular and personal interest greater with steady, indoor work, with due regard to privileges. Outside helpers are more useful in apartment life and near centres of population. Even there, in view of sudden illness and the demands of hospitality, at least one servant is important in a family of sufficient means to live comfortably and receive friends freely.

208. I think that with the work of the house as equally divided as possible much more interest is taken by servants if they live in a family and are made to take pride in their work; and if they can have a room by themselves, no matter how small, they are much more contented. One of our servants has been in the family 30 years and one 15.

The cooks, who are not usually so competent, do not stay so long. I think we have had four in the last 12 years, but of course the cooking is very simple.

23. For the future I do not presume to predict. At present I cannot see how employing piece work from a number of outsiders can quite substitute for the really efficient general housework girl with her ever ready, kindly helping hand (two such girls I've had). This is especially true for a mother with a family. At the same time it would do away with the somewhat dubious "girl's room," and for the girl herself, that great loneliness of being in a family but not of it.

41. It seems to me that I should never be quite willing to have the cooking done by some one coming in from outside. Reasons: (1) Plans for the next day are sometimes necessarily changed late in the evening when it would be difficult to notify such a worker. (2) Unless the worker could easily send word to you if she were unable to come, and were more than ordinarily conscientious about it, she might cause considerable inconvenience by failing to send word that she was not coming.

80. I think it might be managed much more to the advantage of employer than of employee. My maids have separate bedrooms, and I wish them to consider my house a home. If I pay now for fifteen hours a day, the wages should be much less for eight, which is the ordinary day's work. Another drawback to the plan, it seems to me, is that young women would be much on the streets, going and coming, and liable to be imposed upon and tempted to spend money for clothes to make a good appearance outside. They are deprived of the shelter of a home.

62. First: The food and cooking that suits one person would not often suit another, and outside cooking presupposes similarity of tastes. Second: Nursery work means night work as well as day, often. Third: Parlor work is from the nature of it rather irregular (early and late), and too many employees coming and going would take away from the quiet atmosphere of a household, and the girl would hardly take as much interest in the family belongings or the family themselves, which would seem a loss.

187. It may interest you to know that when changing cooks I have had all the washing and cleaning and most of the sweeping done by the hour at from 50 cents to $1 per week (depending on season of year) cheaper than my usual wages. That necessitates the second girl doing the cooking and the nursemaid washing dishes, and as each employee objects to doing anything but "her own work," I cannot continue it permanently, as I should much prefer. The fewer servants the less quarreling, breaking, and general waste.

234. The plan of having outside workers come in has never worked with perfect satisfaction because of their dishonesty, gossip, and interference with other servants. If one gets really good workers I think the work is better done than by resident workers, simply because they are working by the day and not by the job. I have tried sending the laundry out each week, paying a fair price (not by the dozen) for the work and have never had it so well done in this way (by the job) as when I get a laundress in by the day, although in making my price I pay at the rate of $2 a day instead of $1.50 as when a woman comes to the house.

258. I do not feel that it will be an uplift morally to employer or employee. Personally I feel a sense of responsibility for those under my roof, and I demand a high order of servant, pay each one well, and expect intelligent service in return. Where so many are kept none are overworked and each one has fixed "times off" with extra privileges from time to time. I look to it that bank accounts are started and pay a certain rate of interest yearly on annual savings. It is not possible for women to earn so much in shops and factories as in domestic service when lodging and board are considered.

235. The solution of the domestic service situation lies more in the mistress of the household knowing personally the details of the business than elsewhere. A domestic has respect for one who knows better about it than herself, and a well-instructed mistress of a household knows better how to treat and govern a domestic. Until the rising generation of young girls learns personally to do the principal things required in running a household, the same as a boy requires training in business or a profession in order to conduct it successfully, the domestic service situation will not be solved.

86. It depends upon how one manages. I should feel it necessary to have one

helper always in the house for certain work and to call upon at any and all times, so that as I look at the question now I should say I could employ more outside help in lieu of a second girl's work if I get in a condition to afford it. It might be in the future easier to decide, yet I judge the expense will be more than most families could well bear in making such a change, and at the same time the housekeeper's work would be much harder with no one at hand to call upon for help as needed.

249. It would seem best to have one employee always in the house. I would prefer to have the work done by well-trained people in less time than when done by the ordinary help, and then have the house free from their presence. There would be less company evenings in the kitchen and consequently less expense in light and food. I cannot see how it will be managed to have chamber girls at the hours preferred, as all would wish the chamber work done early in the forenoon. It seems more practical to me to improve all kinds of service and have our employees live in our homes, much as the other way might be desired.

151. It hardly seems possible that the same amount of work could be done at the same expense by outside help. Living where we do, I have to pay $1.50 and car fares, amounting to 26 cents by train, for work by the day, and the women arrive at eight, or later usually, and leave at five. Their work is greater during that time than a house servant's would be, but that is offset, I think, by the latter's beginning at seven and being at hand almost always, if needed I wish to repeat that, I think, if employees know positively that no lady, from fear of trouble, would hesitate to tell a possible employer, honestly, if a girl were incompetent or unfaithful, they would try harder to keep a place and to merit good references.

238. It does not seem impossible. For two years I did my own cooking and had everything else done by women who came in. If some rich person could start a kind of servants' home, so that the girls could have a pleasant lodging place, I don't see why there should be any difficulty in bringing about the substitution of outside help for the present unsatisfactory system. Of course where there are very young children in a family there would have to be special arrangements, but I think the time is coming when well-educated American girls can aid mothers in the care of their children. I had such help when my children were babies, and allow me to say that it is the only kind of nursery maid that a true mother should be willing to trust with the care of her children.

98. I sincerely hope the day is coming when, as I saw it in France this year, regular helpers can be had at reasonable expense who will come to do part of the work each day. I tried this once myself when keeping but one servant, but had to give it up. For slight reasons in her own home my outside helper would fail to come, not thinking it worth while to come for two or three hours daily. Another woman proved dishonest, carrying home with her daily all remnants of food from breakfast or dinner she wished for. This is often the case I am told where they are not kept over one or two meals. As my helper lived near and came only for chamber work for two hours daily, I did not think it necessary to give her food. If I employ an outside worker by the day or for several hours, I am very careful that she should eat in the forenoon and also have a good dinner before she leaves.

61. While realizing the great extravagance of our present mode of life, I should rather try to introduce economy in methods of living than change the character of home life for a typical family, *i.e.*, father, mother, and children. No matter how much workers may come to specialize within the next few years, I, personally, without great change of circumstances, should feel very sorry not to have at least two houseworkers under my roof all the time. I think life would be much harder. Who could answer the family telephone, know the family habits, help in trifling sicknesses, and act quickly in family emergencies, but the mistress or the maids who try to live together for the common good. A large part of our present trouble is with the mistresses; many of them lack justice; many of them try to get bargains, that is, a great deal of work or very experienced service for comparatively small pay, and some of them live beyond their means.

58. I should not wish to diminish the sense of personal responsibility on both sides by employing outside help more than is absolutely necessary. In case of emergency,

illness for example, I should want my own servants in the house, not a series of accommodators, and a servant should bear in mind that in case of her own illness or misfortune she is (if she deserves it) sure of the best care and warmest interest. Standards of housekeeping differ. Given A, a careless housekeeper in a luxurious house, and B, a fastidious housekeeper in more modest circumstances, it is sure to follow that the accommodator assumes that what is "good enough" for A should please B. It rests with employers to make "training" bear fruit, and experience does not lead me to think that there would be greater demand for trained service by the hour or the day than there now is by the month and year, nor that the servant would profit by the change.

139. It seems to me impossible except in exceptional cases. Reasons: First. I have known of such help being sought without success, showing that at present it is not deemed desirable. Second. Few servants work near their own homes, and boarding together in numbers suggests many undesirable possibilities. Third. The demands on the time of the mother of a large family are so uncertain that there must be someone, not a stranger, at hand for emergencies. Sudden calls arise continually and she cannot wait for "hours." Fourth. Frequent, sudden, and slight illnesses. Fifth. The unexpected demands of hospitality. Sixth. Between right-minded persons a bond springs up when the same house is "home" to both. I doubt if any professional effort can do more than secure a scale of requirements as to ability on one side, comfortable working and sleeping quarters, proper food and hours on the other. The hours of every woman who is desirous of promoting comfort and cheer in a home, mistress as well as maid, must be elastic. The element of personal devotion is a greater factor in this work than in any other.

76. I have the strongest convictions against any such plan. I think mistresses are better off in every way to have the responsibility and care of a household. It is infinitely better for the children, both morally and physically. I think servants are much better off at service in a family; their health and food are better; they come in contact with a better side of life than they do in shops, factories, trades, etc. Good manners, charity, and other virtues are being constantly exercised in a family life and I think these things are worth much. As to competency, a mistress must expect many trials with her servants and constant disappointments. But in spite of all there is much more good than evil among the serving class. In an experience of very nearly 50 years in Boston, I have not had more than one case of dishonesty that I can remember. Intemperance is the most frequent fault. I am constantly reminded that one must hold the reins of government firmly but *gently*. Servants are appreciative, very much so I think, of sympathy and thoughtfulness for them. It is my conviction too, that a training school for mistresses would be an admirable plan; therefore lectures on all parts of household economy would help to solve the troublesome servant question, if householders could be induced to face and understand what *their* responsibilities really are.

There seems to be no reason why workers living outside the family should be less trustworthy than resident workers, on the contrary, the fact that they were required to begin work at a definite hour each morning would tend to increase reliability and habits of neatness and punctuality. The Household Aid Company of Boston, whose plan for solving the domestic problem is given in detail on page 32, disposed of any danger of unsanitary home conditions by having its "aids" live in a central house under the supervision of a competent matron. While home interests might take some of the time and strength of non-resident employees, it is a question whether the increased responsibility and the economy natural to a worker

who could understand her employer's problems from her own home experience, would not counterbalance any loss of strength.

The objections as a whole seem to be singularly unprogressive, as they are identical with those urged 60 years ago against any attempt on the part of women to enter the industrial and professional worlds, *i.e.*, lack of punctuality and perseverance. Time has shown the industrial world that women may be trained to habits of promptness and reliability, and doubtless housekeepers who act as pioneers in employing outside workers will meet the same good results as to promptness, efficiency, and interested service.

The above facts suggest the conclusion that, notwithstanding the scarcity and incompetence of houseworkers, employers as a whole do not seem to be able to offer any tangible inducements to working women to enter domestic service; nor do they seem sufficiently aroused to the seriousness of the domestic problem to try experiments in the hope of solving it.

A canvass recently made by a woman's magazine revealed that about one-eighth of the families in the United States employ servants, and of that one-eighth it is safe to say that two-thirds employ a general maid. The majority of the negative answers to the Union's questions were received from women employing only one maid-of-all-work, yet the general housework girl is pre-eminently the employee for whom the demand exceeds the supply.

The following statistics in regard to general houseworkers, taken from the records of the Domestic Reform League, give an accurate view of the situation in Boston as interpreted by the League's experience:

Classification.	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904
Actual number of general houseworkers registered during the year,	506	627	588	618	606	979
Per cent of general houseworkers registered as compared with total number of workers registered,	17+	19+	20+	20+	18+	21+
Total number of general houseworkers placed during the year,	451	493	467	368	443	772
Per cent of general houseworkers placed as compared with number of general houseworkers registered,	89+	78+	79+	60+	73+	78+
Per cent of general houseworkers placed as compared with other workers placed: *e.g.*, cooks,	94+	94+	80+	66+	64+	90+
Total orders of employers for general houseworkers,	2,566	3,311	2,995	2,865	2,852	3,757

Classification.	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904
Per cent of orders for general houseworkers as compared with total orders,	39+	39+	44+	43+	37+	40+
Total orders for general houseworkers not filled,	2,115	2,818	2,528	2,477	2,409	2,985
Per cent of general housework orders filled, to total orders filled,	21+	21+	19+	16+	16+	21+
Per cent of other orders not filled, *e.g.*, cooks, as compared with general housework orders not filled:						
General,	82+	85+	84+	86+	84+	79+
Cooks,	64+	70+	56+	58+	60+	56+

The average wage offered for general housework has increased 43 cents in the last two years. The following figures are taken from contracts signed at the Domestic Reform League by general houseworkers:

	1902	1904
Lowest wage paid,	$2.00	$1.50
Highest wage paid,	5.50	7.00
Average wage paid,	3.866	4.291

While the increase of 43 cents in two years seems comparatively small, yet when considered in connection with the increased cost of living, and the fact that the actual money received represents only about one-half of the compensation of houseworkers, it will be seen that their condition has improved very materially in two years. As the increased wage has not been gained as a result of any concerted movement on the part of the workers themselves, it is undoubtedly primarily due to the growing scarcity of general houseworkers. It is also true that the constant growth of American towns and cities, which makes the apartment more and more the only possible home for the family of average income, has increased the demand for maids-of-all-work, because sleeping accommodations are at a premium in modern flats and apartments.

On the other hand, it is equally true that the increasing number of demands made upon general housework girls by employers in their endeavors to keep pace with the growing complexity of modern standards of living has driven the former maid-of-all-work to specialize.

Not only has it become more difficult to prepare the dinners of the average family, but the dinner hour itself seems to grow

later each year, thus lengthening the working day of the domestic employee. It is noticeable that where a family employing one maid-of-all-work formerly expected her to merely place the food on the table, the recent tendency is to require her to remain in the dining room during the entire meal.

How shall the above facts be met? To solve them as one woman wrote, "My husband has solved them by boarding," is to do away with the home and strike a fatal blow at national, civic, family, and individual welfare. Men in the industrial world have seen and taken advantage of the housekeeper's dilemmas. Most labor-saving devices and appliances for the household have been invented by men. They have organized and are successfully operating cleaning companies of various kinds. The perplexed housekeeper is forced to avail herself of man-managed laundries, to eat an increasing number of factory-made foods, and to wear shop-made clothing. The hotel, the apartment, and the restaurant are all man's attempts to help woman solve the great domestic problem.

An actual experiment in supplying houseworkers by the day or hour has been undertaken recently in Boston by the Household Aid Company which was organized in 1903 by the Woman's Education Association to simplify the domestic problem by training and supplying houseworkers by the hour. Its circular distributed to working girls read as follows:

The Household Aid Company is now offering the service of trained helpers for all forms of work in the household.

Groups of applicants will be received at stated intervals to take the course of instruction and practical training in the different branches of household work. There will be no washing or heavy scrubbing.

Applications will be placed on file in the order received, and only for the full course.

Candidates for admission must be young women at least 17 years of age, with the equivalent of a grammar school education, and when possible one year of high school work. They will be received for two weeks' probation without expense to themselves. At the end of that time they will be graded according to their efficiency, and each one will make a contract with the company for a definite length of time, either three or six months, and will receive compensation for a definite number of hours a week. During the term of training, eight weeks (except when former experience or unusual efficiency makes it shorter), this compensation will amount to about $4 a week, and afterward the aid will receive from $0.08 to $0.35 an hour, according to the work she is capable of doing. From this salary a moderate amount for room and board will be deducted by the company, as the aids will reside in the house. Previous experience will count for increased efficiency and value. It is the purpose of the company to fill all higher positions of responsibility with aids already in its employ rather than with newcomers.

Aids will be encouraged to acquire greater skill by attending in their leisure hours special courses in educational institutions.

The course of instruction, which will include lectures by experts, will be given in a central house, and when the term is finished the aids will continue to live at this central house, coming and going to their daily work as in any other business.

This company was organized as a two years' experiment. It registered some 20 young women each year, about 40 in all (although the same aid may be counted twice to make the 40), who were instructed in various branches of housework.

The company was managed by a volunteer committee of the Woman's Education Association, and at the expiration of the two years the committee found that the demands made upon them by the work were so considerable as to make it impossible for them to undertake it for another period. Expense of the training, as in other educational experiments, was so great as to preclude a financial success, and a new committee would not only have had to give much time to the work, but would also have been confronted by the additional burden of raising funds to carry on the course of training. In view of these two facts, it was found impossible to induce a new committee to take up the work, and the Household Aid Company was discontinued. The committee felt that the experiment had been a success, for they had demonstrated the truth of their original proposition — that there is a demand for skilled household service by the hour, and that young women now averse to household labor would seek it as an occupation if certain unacceptable conditions could be modified.

The demand for the aids, while small at first, gradually increased, until, at the expiration of the two years, it was impossible to fill the orders received for workers — this in spite of the fact of training inadequate in amount and scope, owing to lack of funds.

The interest of the employees in the experiment was demonstrated by the many applications for admission to the training school and by the interest in the work shown by the aids. Since the house has been closed, two of these aids have taken a small apartment near the house and are continuing the work.

A more intelligent class of girls than the ordinary domestic was attracted to the work on account of the independence of the life and the removal of the stigma of "living out," due to the fact that the central house was their home, to which they

returned each evening. Since the abandonment of this project, the demand for a similar school has become so great that it would seem to be only a question of time when the Household Aid, or some other company, shall take up the work where it has been laid down.

The Domestic Reform League, while not in a position to establish a training school for day workers, has constantly advised this for perplexed housekeepers. The following figures show the growing demand for the outside worker:

Day Workers Supplied by the Domestic Reform League.

Year.	Number	Year.	Number
1898,	590	1902,	931
1899,	700	1903,	1,289
1900,	734	1904,	1,639
1901,	836	1905,	2,418

Can the trade of housework be organized so that houseworkers may enjoy the same conditions as workers in other trades? Can houseworkers, for example, ever have specific duties, instead of being obliged merely "to do as they are told" at the whim of their employers? Is any organization possible which will give the houseworker shorter hours with definite time that is free? Many working girls are averse to general housework because of the isolation involved in being the only one of a kind, and in a family, but not of it.

The difference in social status between the domestic worker and the worker in other trades perhaps best explains the general aversion to domestic service. A woman may enter a factory with no credentials besides her own representations; to enter into domestic service she must furnish "the highest references" and be prepared to submit every detail of her past life to the rigid scrutiny of prospective employers, yet the factory worker is regarded as the social superior of the domestic worker. The employing public is largely responsible for this false attitude, but the working girls themselves, who organize clubs and societies for "working women other than domestics," are also responsible.

The "dignity of housework" is inconsistent with a social system which makes the "doing of one's own housework" the

line of demarcation between those who are "in society" and those who are not. Such dignity is also incompatible with feudal traditions or any survival of the belief that the household employee is a chattel to render personal service. The whole idea of personal relation between employer and employee is contrary to the trend of present industrial development, of which monopolies, corporations, and the machine process are characteristics. Though the existing development be only a phase in the evolution of democracy, to be presently outgrown, it is the phase in which we find ourselves. It undoubtedly makes more sensitive the dissatisfaction and restiveness of houseworkers in domestic service. It is a question of relative values. Each employer will, at the moment, determine it according to the depth of her conception of democracy. Her attitude toward the "rights" of her employee will be the measure of the reality of her democracy.

The results of the Union's investigation indicate that one of the most striking facts contributing to the present chaotic conditions in domestic service is "apathy," to borrow a word from the politician's dictionary. When the interest of women is aroused, either by education, or through necessity, the domestic problem will be solved.

MSH 22466

END OF
TITLE